

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 15-17 have been amended. Claims 1-4 and 9-17 remain pending in this application. No new matter has been added. Please note that claims have been amended in order to expedite prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce claims of the original scope in a continuing application.

### The Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Poulton.

### The Cited Art

Poulton teaches an apparatus for sensing a user and providing stimuli outputs to a user. The apparatus may be microprocessor controlled. The stimuli may be aural, optical or tactile. More than one user-level system may be linked to provide interactive stimuli.

### The Prior Art Distinguished

Applicant's claims, as amended, all include receiving scripts from a remote server system. Poulton does not show or suggest a remote computer server system. Nor does Poulton show or suggest a local computer that receives force scripts from a remote computer server system. Poulton is concerned with providing user feedback, either based on local programs, or, for interactive applications, based on another user-level system. Applicant, in contrast, is concerned with connecting local systems to a remote server so that the local systems can download scripts for the force actuator from the remote server, and the remote server can receive data from the local systems.

Poulton does not disclose receiving data that did not originate at a user-level system. Poulton is concerned with providing stimuli based on local programming instructions (col 12, lines 6-8) or based on signals received that were generated by another user on a peer-level system (col 17, lines 1-12). In contrast to Poulton, Applicant's claims include the local

computer receiving force scripts that come from a remote computer server, not a peer user-level system. Poulton does not disclose such an arrangement. While Poulton discusses peer-to-peer connections for the purpose of peer-to-peer interaction, Applicant claims a client-to-remote server connection, with the remote server providing the scripts which control forces exerted by the actuator. Since Poulton does not disclose receiving force scripts from a remote server, Applicant's claims are not anticipated by Poulton.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this matter, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
HICKMAN STEPHENS COLEMAN & HUGHES, LLP



Michael D. Plimier  
Reg. No. 43,004

P.O. Box 52037  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0746  
Telephone: (650) 470-7430

